

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
HOUSTON DIVISION**

**UNITED STATES OF AMERICA**

*versus*

**WILMAR RENE DURAN GOMEZ**

§  
§  
§  
§  
§

**CRIMINAL NO. H-10-459-S**

**DEFENDANT’S UNOPPOSED MOTION FOR CONTINUANCE**

**TO THE HONORABLE JUDGE KENNETH HOYT:**

**COMES NOW WILMAR RENE DURAN GOMEZ**, Defendant, by and through his attorneys of record, WENDELL A. ODOM, JR. and NEAL DAVIS, III, and hereby requests this honorable Court consider the merits of this motion and, in turn, grant this motion based upon the following:

**I**

The court previously issued a scheduling order as follows:

**Jury trial set for September 26, 2016**

**II**

On April 9, 2013, Efrain Rodriguez Mendoza was arrested. Rodriguez Mendoza, who is also eligible for the death penalty, had remained at large since the inception of this case. Rodriguez Mendoza has been appointed two attorneys and is currently in the pre-authorization phase for determination if the government will seek death. It is not anticipated that that decision will be made before the date this case is set for trial. Rodriguez Mendoza, as a co-defendant, has been accused of being intricately involved in the deaths of the two individuals in this case. Consequently, Rodriguez Mendoza is material to Duran’s defense – whether he is a trial co-

defendant or one who will testify against Duran. Counsel requests a continuance until after the government determines whether or not they will seek death against Rodriguez Mendoza.

### **III**

Defense counsel is still in the process of contacting witnesses, engaging experts, conducting a separate investigation, developing mitigation and wrestling with budget constraints and requests. As such it is not possible for the defense to be prepared to proceed to jury selection or trial.

### **IV**

Counsel has spoken to the Assistant United States Attorney in this cause, Ruben Perez, who is not opposed to the filing of this motion. Counsel also spoke to the attorneys representing Rodriguez Mendoza, Tom Berg and Edward Mallett, who stated that are not opposed to the filing of this motion.

### **V**

The Defendant respectfully requests that this Court grant a continuance for the aforementioned reasons and would show that the ends of justice would best be served by the granting of such continuance and that the granting of such continuance outweighs the best interest of the public and the Defendant to a speedy trial pursuant to Title 18 U.S.C., § 3161(h)(7)(A); and furthermore, such period of delay due to a continuance would be excludable as a failure to grant such continuance would deny counsel for the defendants the reasonable time necessary for effective preparation taking into account the exercise of due diligence as pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(ii).

This motion is made in the interest of justice and not for the purposes of delay.

**WHEREFORE, PREMISES CONSIDERED,** Defendant prays this Court grant this motion and in the interest of justice continue this cause so that Defendant may receive a fair trial, and for such other and further relief, general or special, at law or in equity, to which he may show himself justly entitled.

**Respectfully submitted,**

/s/ Wendell A. Odom, Jr.  
**WENDELL A. ODOM, JR.**  
**Texas State Bar # 15208500**  
**Federal Bar # 0947**  
**440 Louisiana, Suite 200**  
**Houston, TX 77002**  
**(713) 223-5575**  
**(713) 224-2815 (FAX)**

/s/ Neal Davis, III  
**NEAL DAVIS, III**  
**Texas State Bar # 24038541**  
**Federal Bar # 706329**  
**440 Louisiana, Suite 200**  
**Houston, TX 77002**  
**(713) 223-5575**  
**(713) 224-2815 (FAX)**

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that a true and correct copy of the foregoing **Motion to Continue** was delivered via electronic filing to the Assistant United States Attorneys, as well as counsel to the co-defendants in this cause on September 7, 2016.

/s/ Neal Davis, III  
**NEAL DAVIS, III**

**CERTIFICATE OF CONFERENCE**

Counsel has spoken to the Assistant United States Attorney in this cause, Ruben Perez, who is not opposed to the filing of this motion. Counsel also spoke to the attorneys representing Rodriguez Mendoza, Tom Berg and Edward Mallett, who stated that are not opposed to the filing of this motion.

**/s/ Neal Davis, III**  
**NEAL DAVIS, III**